UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,594	01/22/2002	Roland E. Williams	P-2180	6960

			EXAMINER
24214	7590	10/18/2006	VO, HUYEN X

JAMES D IVEY
3025 TOTTERDELL STREET
OAKLAND, CA 94611-1742

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 August 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Ito discloses language dictionaries being stored in a memory medium

(*col. 3, lines 14-22*), wherein the memory medium is a CD-ROM, DVD, or memory card

(*col. 3, lines 39-44*). One of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that DVD

and memory card are individual components that are detachable from the system.

2.   In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "*a language processing and

memory module (i) which is physically attachable to and detachable from an appliance*"

has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A

preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the

purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the

claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process

steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190

USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481

(CCPA 1951).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for
> patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by
> the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the

United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application
filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of
an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Ito (US Patent No. 6243675).

5.   Regarding claim 1, Ito discloses a language processing and memory module

which is physically attachable to and detachable from an appliance, which is configured

to communicate directly with the appliance when so attached without the use of a

network which extends outside the appliance (*dictionary 30 is the language module or*

memory attachable to the appliance (navigation system 1) in figure 1), and which is

configured to perform language-specific tasks at the request of the appliance by:

receiving an instruction for language-specific processing from the appliance (*language*

is identified by the appliance and appropriate dictionary is selected); and sending

resulting data of the language-specific processing to the appliance (*selected dictionary*

is used to recognize input speech and result of the recognition is sent back to the

appliance, referring to figures 1-2 and 5).

6.   Regarding claim 2, Ito further discloses the language processing and memory

module of claim 1 wherein the language processing and memory module is configured

to perform language-specific tasks according to a subject language at the requests of

the appliance by also: receiving data representing a character in the subject language

(*figures 4-5*); and sending data specifying a graphical representation of the character to

the appliance (*inherently in the system of Ito because Japanese, English and German use different character fonts*).

7.   Regarding claim 3, Ito further discloses the language processing and memory module of claim 1 wherein the language processing and memory module is configured to perform language-specific tasks according to a subject language at the request of the appliance by also: receiving data representing a user input gesture (*user selects language, col. 5, lines 13-23*); and sending data representing one or more language units of the subject language in accordance with the user input gesture (*select dictionary, col. 5, lines 13-67 or figure 5*).

8.   Regarding claims 4-6, Ito further discloses the language processing and memory module of claim 3 wherein the language units are characters (*dictionary 30 in figure 2*), wherein the language units are words (*dictionary 30 in figure 2*), wherein the language units are phrases (*dictionary 30 in figure 2*).

9.   Regarding claim 7, Ito further discloses the language processing and memory module of claim 3 wherein sending comprises: selecting the one or more language units according to one or more preceding language units, which were previously specified by the user (*figure2, system identify the language intended by the user and select that language*).

10.   Regarding claim 10, Ito further discloses the language processing and memory

module of claim 3 wherein the language processing and memory module is configured

to perform language-specific tasks according to the subject language at the request of

the appliance by also: sending data representing one or more language unit

components which are of the subject language and which correspond to the user input

gesture (*figure 2, system identifies the language of the user's input and select*

appropriate dictionary).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito

(US 6243675) in view of Bellegarda et al. (US 6208971).

13.   Regarding claims 8-9, Ito fails to specifically disclose the language processing

and memory module of claim 7 wherein selecting comprises: determining word-

continuation and name-continuation relationships between the preceding language units

and the one or more language units. However, Bellegarda et al. teach determining

word-continuation and name-continuation relationships between the preceding

language units and the one or more language units (*col. 3, lines 1-11, further details referring to col. 4, line 39 to col. 5, line 67, current word depends on previous words*).

Since Ito and Bellegarda et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Ito by incorporating the teaching of Bellegarda et al. in order to speech command recognition accuracy.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HXV   9/21/2006